



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,671	10/24/2003	Tibor Boros	15685P023DC	9975
8791 7590 08/08/2007 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER PHUONG, DAI	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,671	Applicant(s) BOROS ET AL.	
	Examiner Dai A. Phuong	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 15-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 15-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION.

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 05/24/2007, with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Claim 1-8 and 14 had been canceled. Claims 9-13 and 15-75 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 9-12, 15-19, 21-70 and 72-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mazur et al. (U.S. 6072792).

Regarding claim 9, Mazur et al. disclose a communications device comprising:

a transmitter coupled to an antenna array, the antenna array comprising a plurality of antenna elements (fig. 2, col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 55), the transmitter to transmit a calibration burst (fig. 6, col. 4, lines 4-44).

transmitting a first waveform from a first antenna element of the plurality of antenna elements, the first waveform comprising a combined signal that is a combination of two or more signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10); and

transmitting a second waveform from second antenna elements of the plurality of antenna elements, the second waveform comprising a combined signal each transmitted from an

antenna element of the two or more antenna elements corresponding to each signal (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 10, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 9. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communications device wherein the first antenna element is one of the two or more antenna elements (fig. 2, col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 55).

Regarding claim 11, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 9. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communications device wherein the second waveform comprises a sum of the two or more signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 12, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 9. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communications device wherein the communications device comprises a base station of a radio communications network (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10)).

Regarding claim 15, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 9. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communications device wherein the first antenna element comprises a reference element with respect to which the other antenna elements are calibrated (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 16, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 9. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communications device wherein the communication device comprises a subscriber unit (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15.

Regarding claim 22, Mazur et al. disclose a method comprising: transmitting from a subscriber unit a first waveform from a first antenna element of a plurality of antenna elements coupled to the subscriber unit, the first waveform comprising a combined signal that is a combination of two or more signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10); and

transmitting from the subscriber unit a second waveform from two or more antenna elements of the plurality of antenna elements, the second waveform comprising the two or more signals each transmitted from an antenna element of the two or more antenna elements corresponding to each signal (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10);

wherein the subscriber unit is coupled to an antenna array, the antenna array comprising the plurality of antenna elements (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 23, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 22. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method wherein the subscriber unit is a radio transceiver remote to an array-equipped transceiver and transmits the first and second waveforms to the array-equipped transceiver (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 24, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

Regarding claim 25, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 26, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

Regarding claim 27, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15.

Regarding claim 28, Mazur et al. disclose a communications device comprising:

A transmitter coupled to an antenna array, the antenna array comprising a plurality of antenna elements (fig. 2, col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 55), the transmitter to:

transmit a first data signal and a first calibration signal from a first antenna element of the plurality of antenna elements (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10); and

transmit a second data signal and a second calibration signal from at least one other antenna element in the plurality of elements (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 29, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are identical (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10) and the first and second calibration signals are identical (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 30, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are different (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10), and the first and second calibration signals are identical (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 31, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are identical (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10), and the first and second calibration signals are different (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 32, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are different (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10), and the first and second data it and second calibration signals are different (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 33, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the transmitter transmits the first data signal and the first calibration signal in a time period that overlaps a time period for transmitting the second data signal and the second calibration signal (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 34, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 29.

Regarding claim 35, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 30.

Regarding claim 36, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 31.

Regarding claim 37, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 32.

Regarding claim 38, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 39, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 29.

Regarding claim 40, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 30.

Regarding claim 41, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 31.

Regarding claim 42, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 32.

Regarding claim 43, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the communications device is a subscriber device (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 44, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the communications device is a base (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 45, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device further comprising a receiver to receive information

Art Unit: 2617

processed at a remote transceiver wherein the received information is derived from the transmitted first and second calibration signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 46, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are transmitted on at least one traffic channel and the first and second calibration signals are transmitted on at least one of: at least one traffic channel and at least one calibration channel (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 47, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 28.

Regarding claim 48, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 29.

Regarding claim 49, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 30.

Regarding claim 50, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 31.

Regarding claim 51, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 32.

Regarding claim 52, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 53, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 54, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 47. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method further comprising: receiving the transmitted first and second calibration signals; at a remote device and in response processing the calibration signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 55, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 54. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method further comprising transmitting the processed calibration signals to another device (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 56, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 54. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method of first and second calibration signals to enable the reception of the first and second data (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 57, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 28. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method wherein the first and second data signals are transmitted on at least one traffic channel and the first and second calibration signals are transmitted on at least one of: at least one traffic channel and at least one calibration channel (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 58, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 28.

Regarding claim 59, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 29.

Regarding claim 60, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 30.

Regarding claim 61, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 31.

Regarding claim 62, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 32.

Regarding claim 63, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 64, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 33.

Regarding claim 65, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 58. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device further to process the calibration signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 66, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 58. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device to use the results of processing the first and second calibration signals to device. enable the reception of the first and second data signals (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 67, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 65. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device to transmit the processed calibration signals to another (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 68, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 58. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device further comprising: an antenna array viable to receive the first data signal, the first calibration and the second calibration signal (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 69, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 58. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the first and second data signals are transmitted on at least one traffic channel and the first and second calibration signals are transmitted on at least one of at least one traffic channel and at least one calibration channel (fig. 1 to fig. 8, col. 5, line 44 to col. 11, line 10).

Regarding claim 70, Mazur et al. disclose a method comprising: receiving a burst on a traffic channel of an air-interface protocol (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44); and extracting from the received burst at least a calibration burst (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44).

Regarding claim 72, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 70. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method wherein the method is performed by a subscriber unit (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44).

Regarding claim 73, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 70. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the method wherein the method is performed by a base station (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44).

Regarding claim 74, Mazur et al. disclose a method comprising: inserting a calibration signal into a traffic signal (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44); and transmitting the traffic signal on a traffic channel of an air-interface protocol (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44).

Regarding claim 75, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 74. Further, Mazur et al. disclose the communication device wherein the method is performed by a subscriber unit or a base station (col. 5, line 44 to col. 8, line 44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazur et al. (U.S. 6072792) in view of Miya et al. (Pub. No: 2003/0186725).

Regarding claim 13, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitation in claim 12. However, Mazur et al. do not disclose communications device wherein the calibration burst is transmitted to a user terminal of the radio communications network, the user terminal to use the calibration burst to assist in calibrating the base station.

In the same field of endeavor, Miya et al. disclose communications device wherein the calibration burst is transmitted to a user terminal of the radio communications network, the user terminal to use the calibration burst to assist in calibrating the base station ([0021] to [0023] and [0065]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multi-channel digital transmitter of Mazur et al. by specifically including the calibration burst is transmitted to a user terminal of the radio communications network, the user terminal to use the calibration burst to assist in calibrating the base station, as taught by Miya et al., the motivation being in order to provide a calibration system for the array antenna radio communication apparatus capable of accurately detecting the delay characteristic and amplitude characteristic at the radio reception units.

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

6. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazur et al. (U.S. 6072792) in view of Barrat et al. (U.S. 5592490)

Regarding claim 71, Mazur et al. disclose all the limitations in claim 70. However, Mazur et al. do not disclose the communication device further comprising calculating a spatial signature related measurement using the calibration burst (col. 10, line 35 to col. 11, line 42).

In the same field of endeavor, Barrat et al. disclose the communication device further comprising calculating a spatial signature related measurement using the calibration burst.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multi-channel digital transmitter of Mazur et al. by specifically including disclose the communication device further comprising calculating a spatial signature related measurement using the calibration burst, as taught by Barrat et al., the motivation being in order to transmit spatially multiplexed downlink signals. The result is a dramatic increase in spectral efficiency, capacity, signal quality, and coverage of wireless communication systems.

Response to Argument

7. Applicant, on page 11 to page 12 of his response, argues that *Mazur* does not teach or disclose transmitting a second waveform from two or more antenna elements of the plurality of antenna elements, the second waveform comprising the two or more signals each transmitted from an antenna element of the two or more antenna elements corresponding to each signal, as claimed. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, claims recite “the first wave form” and “second wave form”. However, the claims language does not clearly recite that the first wave form is different or the same the second wave form. Therefore, the Examiner interprets the claims language as best understood. *Mazur* disclose that a transmitting station used to *transmit the bursts of communication signals utilizes transmitter diversity such that bursts of communication signals are transmitted from at least two transmitter branches of the transmitting station* (it is inherent that *Mazur* discloses that the base station transmits *bursts of communication signals from one a plurality of antennas and also transmit the bursts of communication signals from two or more antennas, see figure. 2*). The communication signal bursts transmitted by the transmitter branches during adjacent time slots partially overlap in time. A receiving station, active to receive a burst of a communication signal during one time slot, is able thereby to extract information of a communication signal burst transmitted during an adjacent time slot due to the partial overlap. Moreover, *Mazur* discloses a transmitting station operable in a TDMA communication system at least to communicate a first communication signal burst to a first remote station during a first time slot, and at least a second communication signal burst to at least a second remote station during at least a second time slot.

Applicant, on page 12 to page 13 of his response, argues that Mazur does not discuss transmitting both a data signal and a calibration signal from an antenna element; extracting a calibration burst and inserting a calibration signal into a traffic signal. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, Applicant used a particular words recited in the claim, e.g. "a calibration burst". During patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550- 51 (CCPA 1969). The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999). See MPEP 2111.

Second, Mazur discloses the communication signal bursts are transmitted by the respective transmitter branches permits operation of a transmitting station 32 forming a portion of the radio base station in a manner to permit a mobile terminal 34 to extract adjacent slot information to permit its operation required pursuant to one of the afore-mentioned Standards, e.g., IS-136, GPRS for GSM, and the PDC Cellular Standards. The mobile terminals must be able to extract adjacent slot information to be properly operable. When in the active state, the mobile terminal 34 remains in such state for the entire period of a time slot, here the second time slot, "time slot 2", 12-2. The mobile terminal is in an information state for only portions of a time slot, here the first and third time slots, "time slot 1" 12-1 and "time slot 3", 12-3. In the

Art Unit: 2617

embodiment illustrated in the Figure, during the first and third time slots, the mobile terminal enters the information state at the start-side and close to the end-side of the time slot. When in such state, signal energy of communication signal bursts intended to be transmitted to other mobile terminals are also detected by the mobile terminal which is to be active during the second time slot 12-2. Moreover, the bursts are communicated in manners which also permit receiving stations to extract information from communication signal bursts communicated during adjacent time slots. Viz, a receiving station, active to receive a communication signal burst during one time slot is able also to extract information from signal bursts communicated during adjacent time slots. Furthermore, a Groups of time slots together form frames. Time slot-carrier combinations define channels upon which bursts of communication signals are transmitted to mobile terminals. Because a plurality of channels are defined upon a single carrier, separate communications can be effectuated with a plurality of mobile stations on a single carrier. Communication signal bursts transmitted by a radio base station are referred to as downlink bursts. And communication signal bursts transmitted by a mobile terminal to a radio base station are referred to as uplink bursts.

In order to allow this application, the Applicant is advised to amend these claims more closer to the invention disclosure.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2617


the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen M Duc can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-7503.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dai Phuong
AU: 2617
Date: 07/24/2007


DUC M. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600